

PATENT

Serial No. 10/523,043

Amendment in Reply to Office Action mailed on March 24, 2006

IN THE DRAWING

Please replace FIG 4D with the enclosed replacement FIG 4D.

PATENT  
Serial No. 10/523,043  
Amendment in Reply to Office Action mailed on March 24, 2006

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed March 24, 2006, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks and arguments are respectfully requested.

By means of the present amendment, the current Abstract has been deleted and substituted with the enclosed New Abstract which better conforms to U.S. practice.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings because feature recited in claim 1 related to securing the back plate to the reflector is not shown. In response, FIG 4D has been amended to show securing means, such as screws 20. Further, the specification has been amended for conformance with the changes to FIG 4D, as well as to correct a certain informality noted upon review. A replacement sheet including FIG 4D is enclosed.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the drawings objection and approval of the enclosed proposed drawing changes.

In the Office Action, the Examiner suggested adding headings to the specification. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the

PATENT  
Serial No. 10/523,043  
Amendment in Reply to Office Action mailed on March 24, 2006

Examiner's suggestion, however respectfully decline to add the headings as they are not required in accordance with MPEP §608.01(a).

In the Office Action, claims 1-8 are objected to for certain informalities. In response, claims 7-8 have been canceled without prejudice and claims 1-6 have been amended to clarify the informalities noted by the Examiner, including beginning the dependent claims with 'The' instead of 'A', and deleting reference numerals typically used in European practice that are known to not limit the scope of the claims. Claims 1-6 were not amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents. It is respectfully submitted that the objection of claims 1-8 has been overcome and an indication to that effect is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In addition, claims 1-2 and 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over DE 19752979 (Helbig). Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication that claim 3 contains

PATENT  
Serial No. 10/523,043  
Amendment in Reply to Office Action mailed on March 24, 2006

allowable subject matter. However, Applicants have not rewritten claim 3 in independent form, since it is believed that 1-2, 4-6 and 9-22 are also patentable over Helbig for at least the following reasons.

Helbig, where U.S. 6,276,812 ('812) is the U.S. equivalent, is directed to an electric lamp that may used on a carrier plate 10, shown in FIGs 2 and 4, or used with a reflector 20 shown in FIG 7. (See column 3, lines 22-26 of '812). As shown in FIGs 5-7, a plug 22 is configured to receive the reflector 20 and lamp 1.

It is respectfully submitted that Helbig does not even teach or suggest a resilient annular spring, let alone a back plate having pressure points, where the pressure points, when in contact with clicks of the socket, displace the clicks in the direction of the reflector over a distance so as to put the annular spring under tension, as recited in independent claims 1, 9, 15 and 19.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 9, 15 and 19 are allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-6, 10-14, 16-18 and 20-22 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1, 9, 15

PATENT  
Serial No. 10/523,043  
Amendment in Reply to Office Action mailed on March 24, 2006

and 19.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

It is believed that no additional fees or charges are currently due beyond the fee for one additional independent claim in excess of three. No excess claim fees are due in view of canceled claims 7-8. However, in the event that any additional fees or charges are required for entrance of the accompanying amendment, they may be charged to Applicants' representatives Deposit Account No. 50-3649. In addition, please credit any overpayments related to any fees paid in connection with the accompanying amendment to Deposit Account No. 50-3649.

PATENT  
Serial No. 10/523,043  
Amendment in Reply to Office Action mailed on March 24, 2006

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By Dan Hf  
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
June 26, 2006

Enclosure: Replacement drawing sheet (1 sheet including FIGs 4A-4D)  
New Abstract  
Authorization to charge credit card \$200 for one independent claim in excess of three

**THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP**  
Applied Technology Center  
111 West Main Street  
Bay Shore, NY 11706  
Tel: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101